UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,062	01/29/2001	Adrian P. Wise	94100414(EP)USC1X1C1D3 PD	8453

22887	7590	10/22/2004

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT
2355 MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 September 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 7 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvath et al.

[US Patent No 5,450,599], in view of Dargel et al. [US Patent No 4,398,176].

4.   As per claim 1, Horvath discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a

method of storing data, comprising:

receiving a sequence of data words of a first predetermined width [col 1, lines 15-25 and

lines 37-41; and col 9, lines 32-34] and different respective format serially [col 1, lines 15-19;

col 1, lines 33-37; and col 10, lines 20-37];

splitting the data words of the received sequence to form new data words of a new

sequence, the new data words having a second predetermined width [col 6, lines 63-col 7, lines

3; and col 7, lines 62-col 8, lines 2];

packing the new data words consecutively in a token buffer of a second width without

holes between the new data words [col 8, lines 3-24]; and

unpacking the new data words to reproduce a new sequence of the new data words [

claim 14].

Horvath does not disclose receiving a sequence of data words in parallel.

Dargel discloses receiving a sequence of data words in parallel [col 2, lines 21-25; and

col 20, lines 58-64].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the teaching of Horvath and Dargel because Dargel's teaching of parallel processing

would allow a higher processing speed [Dargel, col 20, lines 62-63].

5.   As per claim 2, Horvath discloses writing a block of data from the token buffer to a

random access memory device configured to store the words of the second width [col 8, lines

11-14; and col 13, lines 17-18].

6.   As per claim 3, Horvath discloses expanding out run length code in the new words [col

6, lines 6-9; and col 7, lines 3-6].

7.   As per claim 4, Horvath discloses the invention as claimed substantially including an

inverse modeler, comprising:

a data unpacker to unpack data words received from an input terminal serially to a

different length format [col 1, lines 15-19; col 6, lines 63-col 7, lines 3; and col 7, lines 62-col 8,

lines 2];

a data expander coupled to the data unpacker [col 8, lines 3-24].

a data padder to pad data tokens received from the data expander [col 4, lines 10-12].

Horvath does not disclose receiving from an input terminal parallel.

Dargel discloses receiving from an input terminal parallel [col 2, lines 21-25; and col 20,

lines 58-64].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the teaching of Horvath and Dargel because Dargel's teaching of parallel processing

would allow a higher processing speed [Dargel, col 20, lines 62-63].

8.   Claims 5 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvath et

al. [US Patent No 5,450,599], in view of Dargel et al. [US Patent No 4,398,176], and further in

view of Morrison et al. [US Patent No 4,985,766].

9.   As per claim 5, Horvath and Dargel do not specifically disclose the data expander

expands out run length codes into runs of zero followed by a level in packed data. Morrison

discloses the data expander expands out run length codes into runs of zero followed by a level in

packed data [col 7, lines 40-54]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Horvath, Dargel and Morrison because

Morrison's teaching would the fullness of the output buffer may be used to determine the

quantisation factor [Morrison, col 1, lines 33-44].

10.   As per claim 6, Morrison discloses the padder pads the last word of expanded tokens [col

2, lines 32-35; and col 4, lines 13-15].

11.   As per claim 7, Morrison discloses the data unpacker deletes data between a flush signal

and a block end signal [col 5, lines 1-47].

12.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

13.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5321. The

examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Follansbee John can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2154

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100